



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,959	04/26/2002	Yong-Seok Jeong	08015.0006	6058

22852 7590 07/01/2009
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

MUSSELMAN, TIMOTHY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3715

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 10/018,959	Applicant(s) JEONG, YONG-SEOK	
	Examiner TIMOTHY MUSSELMAN	Art Unit 3715	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1,7-9,15-17,23-30,34 and 36-40.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/XUAN M. THAI/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that neither the references of Galdes and Sullivan disclose generating an 'identification code' in accordance with 'click information' (the 'click information pertaining to the topic on which the user is seeking counsel). Examiner disagrees. Sullivan clearly discloses in at least col. 2: 40-50 wherein the system tracks the user's attempts to solve a problem via a self help system, and provides information relevant to the user's attempts to a support engineer (i.e. a counselor) upon escalation. Sullivan discloses in col. 3: 25-40 wherein the self help before escalation occurs can be a series of mouse clicks through a series of self-help web pages. While Sullivan does not disclose this history information explicitly as an 'ID code', it is nevertheless coded information suitable for use in a computer system. Applicant has not claimed specific details regarding the format of the ID code, and as such there is no distinguishment over the coded information of Sullivan. Further, the information regarding the 'mouse clicks' sent to the counselor upon escalation is naturally related to the 'query contents', because the users query is precisely the factor guiding the series of clicks through the self help pages. Applicant's assertion that Sullivan does not record 'click information' because the system also presents the user with search strings the user entered is not persuasive (applicant cites col. 12: 19-22). This is because col. 12: 30-45 clearly discloses wherein the counselor may access the 'same self help pages accessed by the user', and as described in col. 3: 25-40, these pages can be navigated via mouse clicks. Figure 5 shows an example page that illustrates how the user can seek help through a series of mouse clicks. Applicant's assertion that the office action did not properly 'ascertain the scope and content of the prior art' nor provide a reason why the prior art would rendered the claimed invention obvious is not persuasive. The office action clearly states that the modification to Galdes in view of Sullivan would have been obvious, simply for the reason that in the art of online help systems, the process described above by Sullivan is established, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate this established concept into other online help systems, such as Galdes, for the purpose of 'allowing for more automation in the self help process', which is precisely the function this feature serves in the system of Sullivan. These would amount to improving the system of Galdes in a manner that has been established in the same art, by at least Sullivan.